

**EVALUATION OF TECHNIQUES TO PREVENT
INTRODUCTION OF ZEBRA MUSSELS (*DREISSENA
POLYMORPHA*) DURING NATIVE MUSSEL
(UNIONOIDEA) CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES**

A Contract Completion Report

Submitted to

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 25486, DFC
Denver, CO 80225**

On behalf of

**Freshwater Mollusk Conservation Society
1417 Hoff Industrial Park
O'Fallon, MO 63366**

by

**W. Gregory Cope
North Carolina State University
Department of Environmental and Molecular Toxicology
Box 7633, Raleigh, NC 27695-7633**

**Teresa J. Newton
U.S. Geological Survey, Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center,
2630 Fanta Reed Rd., La Crosse, WI 54603**

and

**Catherine M. Gatenby
Academy of Natural Sciences, Patrick Center for Environmental Research
1900 Ben Franklin Parkway, Philadelphia, PA 19103**

September 2002

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Because of the declines in diversity and abundance of native freshwater mussels (superfamily Unionoidea), and the potential decimation of populations of native mussels resulting from the rapid spread of the exotic zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*, management options to eliminate or reduce the threat of zebra mussels are needed. Relocating native mussels to refugia (both artificial and natural) has been proposed to mitigate the threat of zebra mussels to native species. Relocation of native mussels to refugia such as fish hatchery facilities or natural habitats within their historic range, which are unlikely to be infested by zebra mussels, necessitates that protocols be developed to prevent the inadvertent introduction of zebra mussels. Several recent studies have developed such protocols, and have assessed their effectiveness on the health and survival of native mussels during subsequent relocation to various refugia. The purpose of this project was to synthesize and evaluate the current protocols and to develop a set of procedures that resource managers and researchers should consider before conducting conservation activities in zebra mussel infested waters. We found that the existing protocols have many common points of concern, such as facility modification and suitability, zebra mussel risk assessment and management procedures, and health and disease management procedures. These conservation protocols may have broad applicability to other situations and locations. A summary and evaluation of the information in these main areas, along with recommended guidelines, are presented in this report.

INTRODUCTION

Native freshwater mussels of the families Margaritiferidae and Unionidae (superfamily Unionoidea) are one of the most rapidly declining faunal groups in the North America. About 67% of the nearly 300 native mussel species found in North America are considered vulnerable to extinction or already extinct (Bogan 1993; Williams *et al.* 1993). The decline of native mussel populations in North America has occurred steadily since the mid 1800s and has been attributed to over-harvest, construction of dams and impoundments, sedimentation, navigation, pollution, and habitat degradation (Fuller 1974; Bogan 1993; Naimo 1995; Brim Box and Mossa 1999; Vaughn and Taylor 1999). An additional recent threat to the native fauna has come from the introduction of the zebra mussel *Dreissena polymorpha*. This species colonizes native mussels and impedes their movement, reduces their ability to feed and eliminate wastes, and competes for food and space (Mackie 1991; Schloesser *et al.* 1996; Strayer 1999).

Because of the declines in diversity and abundance of native mussels and the rapid and severe impacts of zebra mussels on native mussels (Gillis and Mackie 1994; Nalepa *et al.* 1996), a National Strategy for the Conservation of Native Freshwater Mussels was developed to provide a framework for preventing further population declines and species extinction (National Native Mussel Conservation Committee 1998). This document identified a number of conservation needs and outlined goals, strategies, and tasks to address these needs. Listed among these was the recommendation to develop management options for eliminating or reducing the threat of zebra mussels to native mussels. These options included relocating native mussels to artificial and natural refugia. Although many mussel relocations have had relatively poor success (e.g., Cope and Waller 1995), recent studies conducted with improved

techniques, experimental design, and monitoring programs, have been largely successful (Dunn *et al.* 2000; Cope *et al.* 2003). Thus, with the increased likelihood of successful relocation efforts, and the continued range expansion and adverse effects of zebra mussels on native mussel populations, any relocation done to conserve native mussels necessitates that protocols be developed to prevent the inadvertent introduction of zebra mussels.

Several recent studies have developed protocols to ensure that zebra mussels would not be inadvertently introduced during native mussel conservation activities and have assessed the health and survival of native mussels during subsequent relocation (Patterson *et al.* 1997, 1999; Gatenby *et al.* 2000; Nichols *et al.* 2000; Hallac and Marsden 2001; Newton *et al.* 2001). The purpose of this project was to synthesize and evaluate the current protocols and to develop a set of procedures that resource managers and researchers should consider before conducting native mussel conservation activities in zebra mussel infested waters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Almost all of the recent native mussel salvage and relocation projects have used some type of quarantine to prevent the incidental introduction of zebra mussels. The exceptions are those studies whose objective was to remove zebra mussels from fouled native mussels and replace them back at their original location (e.g., Schloesser 1996; Hallac and Marsden 2000). By necessity, most of the quarantine protocols have been location and facility specific. For example, Gatenby *et al.* (2000) reviewed procedures for relocating native mussels from the Ohio River. Likewise, Newton *et al.* (2001) developed a specific set of procedures for relocating native mussels from the Mississippi River to artificial ponds and to fish hatchery facilities. However, these and other protocols developed for specific studies have many

common points of concern, such as facility modification and suitability, zebra mussel risk assessment and management procedures, and native mussel health and disease management procedures, that may have broad applicability to other situations and locations.

Facility-specific concerns and procedures

The availability of aquatic facilities for long-term captive care of freshwater mussels is limited. Thus, most of the salvage and quarantine facilities have involved the short-term use of state and U.S. Government owned fish hatchery ponds and raceways or similar research aquaculture facilities (Dunn and Layzer 1997; Pinder *et al.* 1999; Gatenby 2000; Newton *et al.* 2001). The main facility concerns have focused on the type of rearing or holding system (e.g., ponds, raceways, or above-ground tanks capable of housing hundreds to thousands of mussels), the facility's proximity to the source of relocated mussels (to reduce transportation time and handling stress), on-site water quality for maintenance of mussel health, and production of an algal-based food supply. The objectives of any given conservation project will likely dictate the type of facility or holding system used and any modifications that may be required. Nonetheless, whether used for short-term quarantine or for long-term captive care, all facilities should be able to provide space for isolation and quarantine, water quality characteristics to meet requirements for shell growth and metabolic processes, and food quantity and quality to support growth or reproduction (Table 1).

Specific isolation and containment modifications are probably necessary at most facilities to control and contain source water inflow and potentially contaminated outflow. For example, the outflow of water from quarantine units at a facility may need to be passed through filtration or disinfectant treatments to remove or kill potential zebra mussels before

the water is discharged through normal routes. Containment procedures commonly used at facilities conducting zebra mussel research have included filtration of outflow water through small mesh bags (100 μm or smaller), chlorine treatment tanks (250 mg/L for 1 h), and sand filtration units (J. J. Rach, U.S. Geological Survey, Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center, La Crosse, WI, personal communication). Additional facility precautions may include the capping of all exterior drains to prevent the release of potentially contaminated water from the affected areas and the development of a flood risk assessment, if the facility is within a designated floodplain.

The type of facility selected, however, may influence the relative success of the conservation project; success could depend on its use only as a short-term quarantine facility for subsequent relocation to a natural or artificial system, or its use as a facility for long-term captive care. For example, Newton *et al.* (2001) relocated five species of native mussels (1392 mussels total) from the Upper Mississippi River to a fish hatchery pond after 35 d of quarantine in an artificial pond (81% of mussels survived during quarantine). Mussel survival in the hatchery pond averaged 80% after 1 yr, but only 35% 3 y after relocation. However, of the mussels in a handling-control treatment that were placed back into the Mississippi River after quarantine, survival was 80% after 1 yr and 75% after 3.3 y; the authors attributed the differences in survival between the hatchery pond and riverine relocated mussels to inadequate nutritional resources in the pond. This study illustrates the potential utility of natural or managed refugia over artificial refugia for long-term conservation (Nichols *et al.* 2000; Cope *et al.* 2003). Gatenby (2000) observed similar decreases in survival of six large river species relocated to pond refugia after a 30 d quarantine in above-ground tanks. Mean survival of native mussels during quarantine was 97%. Mean survival after 1 yr in the ponds ranged

between 82 and 93%, depending on species. Despite an abundance of a suitable algal food supply and adequate water quality conditions in the ponds, however, the survival of relocated mussels decreased to 44% after 2 y and to 5% after 3 y. Gatenby (2000) attributed the mortality to high water temperatures in July and August during years two and three of that study. Large river species of mussels relocated (with no quarantine period) to fish hatchery raceways containing flowing water and sediment also showed high survival (95%) after 1 y (Dunn and Layzer 1997), but their long-term (3-5 yr) success in this type of system is unknown.

The relocation of native mussels after quarantine to natural refugia or raceway systems supplied by natural river water will likely have greater success for long-term preservation of the mussels than retention in artificial pond refugia for two key reasons: water temperature and food quality. These two components are critical to the livelihood of any aquatic organism. Rapid fluctuations in temperature, unnaturally high temperatures, and inadequate food supplies are known to cause stress in aquatic organisms, and can lead to mortality (Bayne *et al.* 1973). Thus, temperature, food quality, and food quantity will also be key components to the success of native mussel captive care programs.

Zebra mussel risk assessment and management procedures

Because the threat of zebra mussels to native mussels has been the primary causal factor initiating most of the mussel conservation activities, special precautions have been necessarily incorporated into the collection and handling protocols where native mussels are being relocated. These precautions taken during collection, transport, processing, and quarantine of native mussels are of utmost importance. Only the careful collection and handling of native

mussels from zebra mussel-infested waters will ensure that hatchery fish, native mussels, and other aquatic species in the ecosystem are protected from the incidental introduction of zebra mussels.

In situations where there is uncertainty about the co-existence of zebra mussel populations in the watershed, the most prudent and conservative approach is to treat all native mussels as if they originated from zebra mussel-infested waters. A review of zebra mussel range distribution and population dynamics in the particular river basin is also warranted. Particular items of interest include the nearest known reproducing population of zebra mussels to the native mussel collection site, the relative density and potential spawning periods of zebra mussels at that site, and the likelihood of an undetected presence at the mussel collection site (e.g., lack of an active monitoring program).

The optimum time for collection of native mussels for a given conservation project is largely unknown. However, conservation projects should strive to select time periods that reduce the stress associated with handling as much as possible. Potential criteria include choosing a time period that coincides with the absence of zebra mussel larvae in the water column, minimizes the temperature differential between air and water, and does not interrupt the reproductive cycle for most of the species being relocated. Zebra mussel contamination can be minimized by collecting native mussels during early spring or late fall–time periods when zebra mussel larvae are likely not present in the water column or when these larvae are of a sufficient size to be easily seen, respectively. Freshwater mussels are categorized as being either long-term (bradyctytic) or short-term (tachyctytic) breeders. Long-term breeders, like many species of Lampsilines and Anodontines, become gravid in late summer, retain the developing glochidia in the gill marsupia throughout winter, and spawn in early spring

(McMahon and Bogan 2001). In contrast, short-term breeders, like many species of Amblemines, become gravid in early spring and spawn in late summer (McMahon and Bogan 2001).

Newton *et al.* (2001) collected mussels in early spring prior to zebra mussel spawning periods, which generally occur between May and June and September and November in northern temperate regions of the United States and Canada (Mackie 1991). The collection of native mussels in early spring also has an added potential benefit of reduced energetic stresses associated with handling because of the cooler water temperatures (Jokela 1996; Newton *et al.* 2001). For example, glycogen concentrations in *Amblema plicata* were highest between May and July and dropped precipitously thereafter—a pattern that closely paralleled reproduction in this short-term breeder (Monroe and Newton 2001). Similarly, Jokela *et al.* (1993) observed that glycogen concentrations decreased substantially between July and October in *Anodonta piscinalis*, a long-term breeder. Furthermore, Jokela (1996) suggested that transplanting females before fertilization or during the early development of the brood had no detectable effect on reproductive output.

Data on energetic reserves in marine bivalves contradict the recently reported data in freshwater bivalves. In the marine environment, it has been suggested that mussels collected in fall may be able to better withstand handling stress because of their higher energy reserves and because their metabolism is slowed due to the cooler water temperatures (Bayne *et al.* 1973). For example, by mid to late fall, the marine species *Mytilus edulis* and *M. trossulus* had accumulated abundant carbohydrate energy reserves (Hawkins and Bayne 1985; Kreeger 1993; Kreeger *et al.* 1995). The differences between marine and freshwater species may be due to differing reproductive strategies. However, results from a recent study with

native freshwater mussels suggest a similarity to marine species in that some species of native mussels may have greater energy reserves in fall (C. M. Gatenby, unpublished data).

Obviously, this is an area where additional research is needed.

When native mussels are collected from multiple sites in a watershed with a known or suspected gradient in zebra mussel density, working from the least infested site to the most infested site will reduce potential zebra mussel contamination of boats and other equipment. Optimally, boats used to collect or deploy native mussels in zebra mussel infested areas should be cleaned (before and after) by a high-pressure, hot-water wash, and diver wet suits, supplies and equipment (e.g., ropes, buckets, etc.) used in the study should be disinfected with a mild solution of chlorine bleach (25 mg/L) or air dried (3-5 d) before use (Gatenby *et al.* 2000).

If the quarantine or relocation facility is also an operational fish hatchery or aquaculture center, precautionary measures to protect endemic wild species as well as cultured fish species should be considered. Prior to entrance into the facility, a subsample of native mussels should be obtained from the collection site and submitted to a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Fish Health Center (Newton *et al.* 2001) or similar laboratory, to assess potential disease and pathogen presence (see section below on native mussel health and disease management procedures).

After screening for diseases and pathogens, collection of native mussels should proceed with procedures to minimize contamination from adult and larval zebra mussels. These include scrubbing individual native mussels with plastic bristled brushes, visual inspection of all exterior surfaces of the shell with magnifying lenses, and holding cleaned natives in zebra mussel-free water (Table 1). Care should be taken during scrubbing and inspection to avoid overlooking small zebra mussels that may be attached in crevices, portions of damaged shells,

or along the hinge line (Gatenby *et al.* 2000; Newton *et al.* 2001). Only personnel experienced in mussel biology should conduct the inspections to ensure accuracy and efficiency of these procedures.

During collection and processing of native mussels, emersion (exposure to air) and thermal stress should be kept to a minimum. Recent studies have shown that handling mussels over a range of emersion air temperatures (15 to 35°C) and emersion durations (15 to 60 min) did not acutely impair survival, behavior, or biochemical composition (Bartsch *et al.* 2000; Greseth *et al.* 2003). However, a minimal emersion time (< 20 min) is generally recommended from recent efforts (Table 1). Moreover, water temperature and dissolved oxygen concentrations in the holding vessels during collection should be measured frequently (at least once per hour) and maintained at or near ($\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$) the ambient stream conditions at the time of collection with non-chlorinated ice and external aeration, if possible (Gatenby *et al.* 2000).

Depending on the proximity of the native mussel collection site to the quarantine facility, mussels should be transported in coolers covered with moist burlap and kept cool with ice in plastic bags (Gatenby *et al.* 2000; Newton *et al.* 2001; Cope *et al.* 2003). This method is advantageous over the use of water-filled, aerated tanks (Chen *et al.* 2001) because of the reduced need for costly and cumbersome trucks and equipment and of minimizing potential problems associated with maintaining stable dissolved oxygen concentrations in water during transport.

At the quarantine facility, native mussels have generally been held for a minimum of 30 to 35 d (Gatenby *et al.* 2000; Newton *et al.* 2001) to allow any small or previously undetected zebra mussels to become visually apparent upon re-inspection. During this time, basic water

quality measurements (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH) should be made at least daily. Other water chemistry variables such as alkalinity, hardness, potassium, total ammonia nitrogen (TAN), and unionized ammonia should be measured at least weekly to ensure that water quality conditions for minimum life requirements are met (Table 1). In addition, mussels in quarantine should be monitored at least weekly for disease (see section below on native mussel health and disease management procedures) and mortality.

Isolation of native mussels from other aquatic species, their contact water, nets, or other equipment at the quarantine facility is necessary to protect organismal health and the physical facility. These concerns can largely be addressed by applying standard best practices for maintaining fish health. Disinfection of equipment and supplies for native mussel quarantine should be guided by National Fish Health Policy and Procedures, Part 713, sections FW1 and FW 3 (USFWS 1995); chlorine (200-250 mg/l for 1 h), sodium or potassium salts (saturated solutions) or other chemical treatments (e.g., benzalkonium chloride at 100 mg/L for 3 h) and dessication (3-5 d) have been successfully used or recommended (Reid *et al.* 1993; Waller *et al.* 1996; Gatenby *et al.* 2000).

After the minimum quarantine period (30–35 d), individual mussels are thoroughly re-inspected by hand with magnifying lenses to evaluate the presence of zebra mussels. If zebra mussels are not found, the mussels are deemed zebra mussel-free and can be relocated elsewhere (e.g., to natural or artificial systems or to other facilities for long-term captive care). Because no zebra mussels were found after quarantine in the study of Newton *et al.* (2001), the mussels were subsequently relocated to fish hatchery ponds. In contrast, Gatenby *et al.* (2000) found zebra mussels upon initial re-inspection and consequently held native mussels in quarantine for additional 30 d intervals each time zebra mussels were found, up to a total of

120 d. Because of declines in mussel health and condition over time during quarantine (Patterson *et al.* 1997; Newton *et al.* 2001), Gatenby *et al.* (2000) recommended re-inspection of mussels at 7 d intervals after the initial 30 d period when zebra mussels are found, and to hold them only for 30 additional days after the last zebra mussel is found, to shorten the overall quarantine time. However, the added stress of handling native mussels more frequently must be weighed against the probability of earlier detection of zebra mussels.

Additionally, native mussels could be treated with chemical disinfectants. Certainly, the benefit of this type of treatment must be weighed against the risk of added stress and reduced fitness in the native mussels, but a study by Waller and Fisher (1998) found that limited application of specific chemicals (e.g., 20,000 mg NaCl/L for 6 h) may be feasible for certain tolerant native species. They cautioned, however, that chemical disinfectants cannot guarantee the elimination of all zebra mussels from native mussel shells and stated that pre-treatment or multiple treatment (e.g., once per week) of native mussels and their holding tanks may be most valuable for reducing the time they are held in quarantine. Many fish hatchery and aquaculture facilities may already be using various chemical treatments (Waller *et al.* 1996; Edwards *et al.* 2000, 2002) or hazard analysis protocols such as the Aquatic Nuisance Species-Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (ANS-HACCP) approach (Gunderson and Kinnunen 2001) to prevent the spread of zebra mussels and other aquatic nuisance species during their activities, which may be adapted to the collection, transport, and quarantine of native mussels.

Native mussel health and disease management procedures

Although little is known about the diseases of native freshwater mussels, recent studies have shown the potential for pathogen transmission among native mussels and fish (Starliper

et al. 1998; Starliper and Morrison 2000). The primary concern for fish hatchery or aquaculture facilities that contain native mussels is the potential for transmission of disease and pathogens between host mussels and hatchery fish. Transmissions from host hatchery fish to mussels and from mussel to mussel are also important vectors to control for maintaining mussel health. Therefore, a pathogen and disease monitoring plan for native mussels, similar to that commonly used for hatchery reared fish, should be considered. Hatchery personnel are routinely trained in fish health protocols and record keeping; these procedures could easily be adapted for monitoring mussel health. U.S. Government standards and protocols currently exist for a disease control and classification system for coldwater fish (salmonid) pathogens—similar guidelines for warmwater fish or native mussels do not exist (USFWS 1995). Revisions to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fish Health Policies and Procedures are currently underway to include warmwater fish and other aquatic organisms (Richard Nelson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, La Crosse Fish Health Center, Onalaska, WI, personal communication). Until those changes are implemented, however, native mussels may only be screened in the near term for reportable coldwater pathogens and diseases. On a positive note, a recent study evaluating the effect of depuration on the transmission of the bacterial fish pathogen *Aeromonas salmonicida* (the causative agent of fish furunculosis) between the unionid *Amblema plicata* and two strains of Arctic char *Salvelinus alpinus* found that the minimum 30-d quarantine of native mussels recommended for preventing the spread of zebra mussels was sufficient for depuration of the fish pathogen and eliminating transmission of the disease (Starliper 2001). Therefore, when adequate safeguards and standard best practices for fish health are used in combination with a 30-d quarantine, disease and pathogen transmission risks should be minimal. Nonetheless, native mussels held in quarantine should be screened

prior to entrance into the quarantine facility and monitored monthly throughout the duration of their captive care to document disease and pathogen incidence and history. More research and policy development is needed in this area to ensure protection of both fish and native mussels.

Maintaining the physiological condition of native mussels during quarantine is difficult because diet and nutritional requirements are poorly understood. Although the specific time course for changes in biochemical indices of mussels due to quarantine is unknown, recent studies have shown that substantial decreases in glycogen concentrations occur in as little as 7 to 35 d after quarantine. For example, Patterson *et al.* (1997), found that glycogen concentrations in mantle tissue in *Amblema plicata* and *Quadrula pustulosa* dropped significantly after 7 d in quarantine and by day 30, concentrations had declined to only 15-31% of that measured in wild-caught specimens. Likewise, glycogen concentrations in foot tissue of *A. plicata* decreased 44% from 279 ± 191 mg/g dry wt. at day 0 to 178 ± 105 mg/g dry wt. after 35 days in quarantine (Newton *et al.* 2001).

Based on the relatively poor physiological condition of native mussels after quarantine shown by the previous studies, it is critical to provide the best source of nutrition during quarantine. Previous studies have relied on an algal based diet, either produced *in situ* by stimulating algal growth with fertilizers in ponds or cultured indoors on site and added directly to mussel holding tanks (Gatenby *et al.* 1997; Patterson *et al.* 1997, 1999; Gatenby 2000; Gatenby *et al.* 2000; Newton *et al.* 2001). As a precautionary note, if mussels are to be quarantined or relocated to ponds, standard commercial pond fertilizers should not be used to stimulate growth of algae. The potassium levels in commercial fertilizers are toxic to freshwater mussels (Imley1973). Secondly, the nitrogen:phosphorous ratio (N:P) of the standard 10:10:10 nitrogen:phosphorous:potassium (N:P:K) fertilizer will not promote suitable

algae for mussels, which typically require an N:P ratio of 10:1 (McCombie 1953). An unsuitable, or indigestible filamentous blue-green algae will result when 10:10:10 N:P:K is used. Therefore, we recommend using the fertilizers indicated in Table 1, following Gatenby *et al.* (2000). Although feeding requirements for native mussels will likely depend on the species involved, temperature conditions, and metabolic activity, Gatenby *et al.* (2000) recommended that native mussels be fed 1×10^5 cells/mL or 4.0 mg dry weight/L twice daily (Table 1). This was, however, a conservatively high recommendation based on initial feeding studies of freshwater mussel assimilation efficiency. This concentration resulted in the greatest assimilation of organic carbon, but a significant amount of this ration went unused by the animals (Gatenby 2000). More recent data indicates that a diet ration of $2.0-5.0 \times 10^4$ cells/mL or 1.9 mg dry weight/L per feeding chamber should maintain mussel condition during summer growth periods (C. M. Gatenby, unpublished data). Particle concentrations should be monitored and not allowed to drop below 60% of this recommended ration. Feeding frequency will depend on the species and total biomass being held in captivity (C. M. Gatenby, unpublished data). Thus, monitoring the particle concentration on a daily basis is necessary. Initially, particle concentration may need to be monitored 2-3 times daily until the manager is familiar with the particle depletion rate or clearance rate of the native mussels held in captivity.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Native freshwater mussels should only be relocated from existing areas as a last resort (Cosgrove and Hastie 2001). Other options to relocation and salvage, such as periodic cleaning and replacement (Hallac and Marsden 2000, 2001), and the use of natural or managed

refugia (Nichols *et al.* 2000), should be considered as first alternatives. However, if freshwater mussel relocations are required to conserve localized populations from zebra mussels or other catastrophic events, the concerns and procedures described in this paper should provide general guidance for developing plans to prevent the incidental introduction of zebra mussels during these activities and for maintaining the health of the native refugees while under captive care.

In addition, procedures for ensuring long-term viability of native mussel populations need to be considered throughout the planning and implementation process. For example, similarities in water quality, substratum characteristics, food, and necessary fish hosts among the systems are critical elements in a native mussel relocation strategy. Additional ecological and evolutionary concerns, such as retention of genetic diversity of the mussel populations, need to be carefully considered before relocating native mussels to natural refugia, especially if the mussels are to be relocated between river basins or between sub-basins of the same river system (Villemela *et al.* 1998; Storfer 1999).

Because of costs and limited availability of facilities for quarantine and captive care of native mussels, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and its resource conservation and management partners, may wish to designate several facilities within regions of the United States that can accept, hold, and screen mussels for disease and pathogens. These facilities may include state or national fish hatcheries, research or aquaculture centers, and fish health centers.

To our knowledge, this synthesis represents the “state-of-the-science” for minimizing the incidental introduction of zebra mussels during native mussel conservation activities and for ensuring their short and long-term health and viability. Readers of this document should be

cautioned that the information presented herein is only recommended guidelines and that future improvements to procedures may be made through research and policy development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was funded by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, through a contract with the Freshwater Mollusk Conservation Society. Linda Drees and Tina Proctor provided valuable insight on the relevance of the project to resource managers. Steve Ahlstedt, Arthur Bogan, Heidi Dunn, Jerry Farris, Doug Jensen, Patricia Morrison, Pam Thiel, and Kurt Welke provided information critical to preparation of the document. We thank Robert Anderson, Heidi Dunn, Richard Neves, Jerrine Nichols, Tom Watters, and Kurt Welke for reviewing a draft of the document.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bartsch, M. R., Waller, D. L., Cope, W. G., and Gutreuter, S. 2000. Emersion and thermal tolerances of three species of unionid mussels: survival and behavioral effects. *Journal of Shellfish Research* **19**:233-240.
- Bayne, B. L., Thompson, R. J., and Widdows, J. 1973. Some effects of temperature and food on the rate of oxygen consumption by *Mytilus edulis*. In: *Effects of temperature in ectothermic organisms*, (W. Wieser, ed), 181-193. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Bogan, A. E. 1993. Freshwater bivalve extinctions (Mollusca: Unionoida): a search for causes. *American Zoologist* **33**:599-609.
- Brim Box, J., and Mossa, J. 1999. Sediment, land use, and freshwater mussels: prospects and problems. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **18**:99-117.

- Chen, L.Y., Heath, A.G., and Neves, R. 2001. An evaluation of air and water transport of freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae). *American Malacological Bulletin* **16**:147-154.
- Cope, W. G., and Waller, D. L. 1995. Evaluation of freshwater mussel relocation as a conservation and management strategy. *Regulated Rivers: Research and Management* **11**:147-155.
- Cope, W. G., Hove, M. C., Waller, D. L., Hornbach, D. J., Bartsch, M. R., Cunningham, L. A., Dunn, H. L., and Kapuscinski, A. R. 2003. Evaluation of relocation of unionid mussels to *in situ* refugia. *Journal of Molluscan Studies* **69**: in press.
- Cosgrove, P. J., and Hastie, L. C. 2001. Conservation of threatened freshwater pearl mussel populations: river management, mussel translocation and conflict resolution. *Biological Conservation* **99**:183-190.
- Dunn, C. S., and Layzer, J. B. 1997. Evaluation of various holding facilities for maintaining freshwater mussels in captivity. In: *Conservation and management of freshwater mussels II: initiatives for the future*, (K. S. Cummings, A. C. Buchanan, C. A. Mayer, and T. J. Naimo, eds), 205-213. Proceedings of a UMRCC Symposium, 16-18 October 1995, St. Louis, Missouri. Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee, Rock Island, Illinois.
- Dunn, H. L., Sietman, B. E., and Kelner, D. E. 2000. Evaluation of recent Unionid (Bivalvia) relocations and suggestions for future relocations and reintroductions. In: *Freshwater Mollusk Symposia Proceedings*, (R. A. Tankersley, D. I. Warmolts, G. T. Watters, B. J. Armitage, P. D. Johnson, and R. S. Butler, eds), 169-183. Ohio Biological Survey, Columbus, Ohio.

- Edwards, W. J., Babcock-Jackson, L., and Culver, D. A. 2000. Prevention of the spread of zebra mussels during fish hatchery and aquaculture activities. *North American Journal of Aquaculture* **62**:229-236.
- Edwards, W. J., Babcock-Jackson, L., and Culver, D. A. 2002. Field testing of protocols to prevent the spread of zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha* during fish hatchery and aquaculture activities. *North American Journal of Aquaculture* **64**:220-223.
- Fuller, S. L. H. 1974. Clams and mussels (Mollusca: Bivalvia). In: *Pollution Ecology of Freshwater Invertebrates*, (C. W. Hart, Jr., and S. L. H. Fuller, eds), 215-273. Academic Press, New York.
- Gatenby, C. M. 2000. A study of holding conditions, feed ration, and algal foods for the captive care of freshwater mussels. Ph.D. Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. 237 pp.
- Gatenby, C. M., Parker, B. C., and Neves, R. J. 1997. Growth and survival of juvenile rainbow mussel, *Villosa iris* (Lea 1829) (Bivalvia: Unionidae) reared on algal diets and sediment. *American Malacological Bulletin* **14**:57-66.
- Gatenby, C. M., Morrison, P. A., Neves, R. J., and Parker, B. C. 2000. A protocol for the salvage and quarantine of unionid mussels from zebra mussel-infested waters. In: *Freshwater Mollusk Symposia Proceedings*, (R. A. Tankersley, D. I. Warmolts, G. T. Watters, B. J. Armitage, P. D. Johnson, and R. S. Butler, eds), 9-18. Ohio Biological Survey, Columbus, Ohio.
- Gillis, P. L., and Mackie, G. L. 1994. Impact of the zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, on populations of Unionidae (Bivalvia) in Lake St. Clair. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **72**:1260-1271.

- Greseth, S. L., Cope, W. G., Rada, R. G., Waller, D. L., and Bartsch, M. R. 2003. Biochemical composition of three species of unionid mussels after emersion. *Journal of Molluscan Studies* **69**: in press.
- Gunderson, J. L., and Kinnunen, R. E. 2001. Aquatic nuisance species–hazard analysis and critical control point training curriculum. Minnesota Sea Grant Publication No. MNSG-F11 and Michigan Sea Grant Publication No. MSG-00-400. 78 pp.
- Hallac, D. E., and Marsden, J. E. 2000. Differences in tolerance to and recovery from zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) fouling by *Elliptio complanata* and *Lampsilis radiata*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **78**:161-166.
- Hallac, D. E., and Marsden, J. E. 2001. Comparison of conservation strategies for unionids threatened by zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*): periodic cleaning vs quarantine and translocation. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **20**:200-210.
- Hawkins, A. J. S., and Bayne, B. L. 1985. Seasonal variation in the relative utilization of carbon and nitrogen by the mussel *Mytilus edulis* budgets, conversion efficiencies and maintenance requirements. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **25**:181-188.
- Imlay, M. J. 1973. Effects of potassium on survival and distribution of freshwater mussels. *Malacologia* **12**:97-113.
- Jokela, J. 1996. Within-season reproductive and somatic energy allocation in a freshwater clam, *Anodonta piscinalis*. *Oecologia* **105**:167-174.
- Jokela, J., Uotila, L., and Taskinen, J. 1993. Effect of castrating trematode parasite *Rhipidocotyle fennica* on energy allocation of freshwater clam *Anodonta piscinalis*. *Functional Ecology* **7**:332-338.

- Kreeger, D. A. 1993. Seasonal patterns in utilization of dietary protein by the mussel *Mytilus trossulus*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **95**:215-232.
- Kreeger, D. A., Hawkins, A. J. S., Bayne, B. L., and Lowe, D. M. 1995. Seasonal variation in the relative utilization of dietary protein for energy and biosynthesis by the mussel *Mytilus edulis*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **126**:177-184.
- Mackie, G. L. 1991. Biology of the exotic zebra mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, in relation to native bivalves and its potential impact in Lake St. Clair. *Hydrobiologia* **219**:251-268.
- McCombie, A. M. 1953. Factors influencing the growth of phytoplankton. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* **10**:253-282.
- McMahon, R. F., and Bogan, A. E. 2001. Mollusca: Bivalvia. In: *Ecology and classification of North American freshwater invertebrates*, (J.H. Thorpe & A.P. Covich, eds), 331-429. Academic Press, New York.
- Monroe, E. M., and T. J. Newton. 2001. Seasonal variation in physiological condition of *Amblema plicata* in the Upper Mississippi River. *Journal of Shellfish Research* **20**:1167-1171.
- Naimo, T. J. 1995. A review of the effects of heavy metals on freshwater mussels. *Ecotoxicology* **4**:341-362.
- Nalepa, T. F., Hartson, D. J., Gostenik, G. W., Fanslow, D. L., and Lang, G. A. 1996. Changes in the freshwater mussel community of Lake St. Clair: from unionidae to *Dreissena polymorpha* in eight years. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* **22**:354-369.
- National Native Mussel Conservation Committee. 1998. National strategy for the conservation of native freshwater mussels. *Journal of Shellfish Research* **17**:1419-1428.

- Newton, T. J., Monroe, E. M., Kenyon, R., Gutreuter, S., Welke, K. I., and Thiel, P. A. 2001. Evaluation of relocation of unionid mussels into artificial ponds. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **20**:468-485.
- Nichols, S. J., Black, M. G., and Allen, J. D. 2000. Use of on-site refugia to protect unionid populations from zebra mussel-induced mortality. In: *Freshwater Mollusk Symposia Proceedings*, (R. A. Tankersley, D. I. Warmolts, G. T. Watters, B. J. Armitage, P. D. Johnson and R. S. Butler, eds), 67-75. Ohio Biological Survey, Columbus, Ohio.
- Patterson, M. A., Parker, B. C., and Neves, R. J. 1997. Effects of quarantine times on glycogen levels of native freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae) previously infested with zebra mussels. *American Malacological Bulletin* **14**:75-79.
- Patterson, M. A., Parker, B. C., and Neves, R. J. 1999. Glycogen concentration in the mantle tissue of freshwater mussels (Bivalvia: Unionidae) during starvation and controlled feeding. *American Malacological Bulletin* **15**:47-50.
- Pinder, M. J., McGregor, M. A., Stickley, C. D., and Ferraro, J. J. 1999. The use of state fish hatchery for the cultivation of freshwater mussels. In: *Musseling in on Biodiversity*, (P. D. Johnson, R. S. Butler, and G. Benz, eds), 36. Proceedings of a Freshwater Mollusk Conservation Society Symposium, 17-19 March 1999, Chattanooga, Tennessee.
- Reid, D. F., Bidwell, J., Carlton, J., Johnson, L., Marsden, E., and Nichols, S. J. 1993. Zebra-mussel specific contaminant protocols. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Contribution No. 890, 28 pp.
- Schloesser, D. W. 1996. Mitigation of unionid mortality caused by zebra mussel infestation: cleaning of unionids. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* **16**:942-946.

- Schloesser, D. W., Nalepa, T. F., and Mackie, G. L. 1996. Zebra mussel infestation of unionid bivalves (Unionidae) in North America. *American Zoologist* **36**:300-310.
- Starliper, C. E. 2001. The effect of depuration on transmission of *Aeromonas salmonicida* between the freshwater bivalve *Amblema plicata* and Arctic char. *Journal of Aquatic Animal Health* **13**:56-62.
- Starliper, C. E., and Morrison, P. 2000. Bacterial pathogen contagion studies among freshwater bivalves and salmonid fishes. *Journal of Shellfish Research* **19**:251-258.
- Starliper, C. E., Villella, R., Morrison, P., and Mathias, J. 1998. Studies on the bacterial flora of native freshwater bivalves from the Ohio River. *Biomedical Letters* **58**:85-95.
- Storfer, A. 1999. Gene flow and endangered species translocations: a topic revisited. *Biological Conservation* **87**:173-180.
- Strayer, D. L. 1999. Effects of alien species on freshwater mollusks in North America. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **18**:74-98.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) 1995. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Service Manual (700 Series), Part 713, Fish Health. Washington, DC.
- Vaughn, C. C., and Taylor, C. M. 1999. Impoundments and the decline of freshwater mussels: a case study of an extinction gradient. *Conservation Biology* **13**:912-920.
- Villella, R. F., King, T. L., and Starliper, C. E. 1998. Ecological and evolutionary concerns in freshwater bivalve relocation programs. *Journal of Shellfish Research* **17**:1407-1413.
- Waller, D. L., and Fisher, S. W. 1998. Evaluation of several chemical disinfectants for removing zebra mussels from unionid mussels. *The Progressive Fish-Culturist* **60**:307-310.

Waller, D. L., Fisher, S. W., and Dabrowska, H. 1996. Prevention of zebra mussel infestation and dispersal during aquaculture operations. *The Progressive Fish-Culturist* **58**:77-84.

Williams, J. D., Warren, Jr., M. L., Cummings, K. S., Harris, J. L., and Neves, R. J. 1993. Conservation status of freshwater mussels of the United States and Canada. *Fisheries* **18**:6-22.